

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed May 31, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this Application, Applicants submit the following remarks. The claims as now presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 1-3 and 5-13 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.

Rejections under §102 and §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,738,454 to Mohammadian et al. (hereinafter Mohammadian). Mohammadian discloses a modular test instrument comprising a base unit and one of a selection of application modules, neither being capable of performing end-user functions without the other, as recited in the Abstract.

In contrast to Mohammadian, claim 1 has been amended to further recite that the second module having a second physical telecommunications interface is also capable of running a second telecommunications protocol that is different than the first telecommunications protocol. Thus, for example, a first module is running a T1 protocol, the second module is capable of running an E1 protocol and is configured to run the T1 protocol. Mohammadian can only run a first telecommunications protocol when the base unit is joined with the application module (as recited in the Abstract), therefore Mohammadian does not disclose or suggest a first module running a first telecommunication protocol and a second module capable of running a second telecommunications protocol which is in fact running the first telecommunications protocol. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 is believed to have been overcome.

Claim 7 recites making the interface channels appear contiguous across the first telecommunications interface and the second telecommunications interface. This is recited in the specification as filed at page 6, lines 4-11. The

-7-

Examiner stated that the same is recited by Mohammadian at column 7, lines 21-31. A careful review of Mohammadian fails to disclose any discussion of interface channels nor the act of making channels across different modules appear contiguous. Accordingly, claim 7 is believed allowable over Mohammadian. Claims 2, 3 and 5-8 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mohammadian is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohammadian in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,662,211 to Weller (hereinafter Weller). Mohammadian has been discussed above. Weller discloses a method system for providing conference services in a telecommunication system. Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mohammadian in view of Weller is believed to have been overcome.

New Claims

Claims 11-13 have been added, support for these claims can be found in Figure 1 and in the specification as filed at page 4, line 13 through page 5, line 17. Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Claim 13 includes similar language as claim 1 and is believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, claims 11-13 are believed allowable.

The prior art made of record is not believed to disclose or suggest the present invention.

-8-


Conclusion

In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing claims 1-3 and 5-13 in condition for allowance. A Notice to this affect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this Response, that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' Representative at the number below.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 366-9600, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 40,150
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 366-9600
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805

Attorney Docket No.: EMP04-09Dated: July 25, 2005